

Nos. 2 to 5, above described, having a short, thick, massive body, and broad, but comparatively thin jaws, which are also different in form. Some of the differences in size and proportions, and in the suckers, observed among the four specimens referred to the latter species may be due to sex; for the sexes differ considerably in these characters in all known cuttlefishes.—*American Journal of Science and Arts*, Feb. 1874.

*Umbellula from Greenland.* By JOSHUA LINDAHL.

Mr. Lindahl has written a paper on the two specimens of *Umbellula* taken on the coast of Greenland. It will appear in the next volume of the 'Kongl. Vetenskaps-Akad. Handlingar' of Stockholm, illustrated with three quarto plates, each containing several figures.

Mr. Lindahl considers the two specimens different from one another and from the *Umbellula encrinus* of Linnaeus figured by Mylius and Ellis. He observes he must confess that the difference may depend upon the difference of age, and as for *U. encrinus* upon imperfection in the figure and description. At all events, he thinks it better to describe his two specimens as two different and new species in order to call attention to the differences, observing "that when new investigations of the deep sea have brought together richer materials, as no doubt they will, if I have committed a mistake in this respect it will be easily corrected." He considers that *Umbellula* and *Crinillum* form one group, as Dr. Gray has pointed out. He regards them as true Pennatulids, and puts them among the "Zunft" Pennatulidæ as the fifth family, *Umbellulæ*, close to the family *Bathyptilæ* (Kölliker, 'Die Pennatuliden,' p. 380). The rachis, or *pars polypifera*, is about one fortieth of the length of the stem; polypes not retractile, without calyces, the lateral ones large and the dorsal small; the zooids are crowded in lateral and ventral shields ("Wülste," Köll.); the axis square, with one deep groove on each side; no spicula in any part of body.

*On the Bos pumilus of Sir Victor Brooke.*

By Dr. J. E. GRAY, F.R.S. &c.

Sir Victor Brooke's paper in the last number of the 'Annals' shows that he does not understand the question between us, and it contains many erroneous statements. I will therefore state the question as shortly as I can.

Sir Victor Brooke states at p. 159:—"Turton, having founded the name *Bos pumilus* upon Pennant's 'Dwarf,' it follows that the horns spoken of and figured by Pennant are typical specimens of '*Bos pumilus*.'" The statement that the fragment of the forehead and horns are typical of Pennant's "Dwarf," and therefore of the *B. pumilus* of Turton, who never refers to the specimen, is entirely inaccurate, as the following statement will prove.

Columna figured a buffalo from Morocco. Pennant and Turton abbreviated his description and called it the dwarf buffalo and *Bos*

*pumilus*, thus making it the type of their species. The forehead and horns of a young ox were in the Museum of the Royal Society. Pennant thought that they belonged to his dwarf buffalo, but in his second edition said that he *now* found that they belonged to the Cape ox. Turton, in his account of *Bos pumilus*, made no reference to these horns, which Sir Victor Brooke says (but I do not think he has proved it) are the horns of a young *Bos brachyceros* of Western Africa, and proposes to change the name of this ox to *Bos pumilus* of Turton, established on an animal from Morocco, and not, as Sir Victor Brooke asserts in his paper, on the forehead and horns in the Museum of the Royal Society, the existence of which Turton does not notice. The animal from Morocco he named *B. pumilus* is supposed to be a young or dwarf variety of the common buffalo, and is certainly not the West-African bush-ox (*Bos brachyceros*).

If Sir Victor Brooke cannot see the mistake he has made, I have done my best to enable him to do so; and it is this non-appreciation of such questions that renders his prolix synonymy in various cases useless and misleading.

*On Felis colocolo, Hamilton Smith, F. Cuvier, and Geoffroy.*

By Dr. J. E. GRAY, F.R.S. &c.

Major Hamilton Smith made a figure of an animal "said to have been shot in the interior of Guiana by an officer of Lewenstein's Riflemen, and by him stuffed and sent to England, but which probably never reached its destination." It is represented as a white cat, with various-sized longitudinal brown dashes on its neck and body, with slate-coloured legs and feet, and a slender black tail with numerous white rings.

Of this drawing an account was published in Griffith's 'Animal Kingdom,' in Geoffroy and Cuvier's 'Histoire Naturelle des Mammifères' (where the animal is said to come from Surinam), and in Jardine's 'Naturalist's Library,' iii. p. 256, pl. xxvi., where the legs are erroneously left pale-coloured, though said to be blackish in the description.

I have never seen this cat, and I am not aware of its ever having been seen or of its being in any museum in Europe. It certainly is not the *Felis colocolo* of Molina, from Chili, figured by Philippi, Wiegmann's 'Archiv,' 1870, p. 41, t. i. fig. 7, and t. iii. figs. 1 & 2.

My late friend and teacher, Colonel Hamilton Smith, drew animals most beautifully and with great facility, and made a very large collection of sketches and drawings of them and of antiquities and costumes, which he collected from museums that he visited, and books, and even fragments of skins. Unfortunately, instead of drawing the specimen or the figure of the animal which he examined as it was, he had the habit of improving its attitude, and even of making a beautiful drawing from a bad specimen, or from a fragment of a skin, or from a rough sketch, or from a woodcut or other figure which he found in some old book; and he very often did not mark his drawings whence or how they were obtained; so